Standard V Program Re-approval Template

Submit completed form to your liaison by June 1, 2009.

Institution: Lesley University at Tacoma

Date: June 1, 2009

Dean/Director: Joseph Cambone, Associate Dean, School of Education   Signature   _____

*Note: Teacher candidate evidence takes many forms. In order to demonstrate the range of evidence types, we have organized our examples of **Teacher-Based Evidence** into two categories: I. Examples of specific assignments/tasks that signify skills candidates should demonstrate as evidence of having met standards; and II. Excerpts from rubrics that provide examples of how candidate evidence is being assessed. **Student-Based Evidence** is similarly organized: I. Excerpts from rubrics providing evidence of how teacher candidate impact on student learning and engagement is being assessed; and II. An overview of tasks candidates complete with P-12 students; the actual evidence and student work products will vary depending on the context.*

What are the major examples of evidence in your program for Standard 5.1: Knowledge of Subject Matter and Curriculum Goals? Please be as specific as possible in describing the evidence.

Criteria - *Teacher candidates positively impact student learning that is:*	Teacher-Based Evidence *Teacher demonstrates capacity to provide effective learning experiences.*	Student-Based Evidence *Students demonstrate engagement in effective learning opportunities.*
A. Content driven. All students develop understanding and problem-solving expertise in the content area(s) using reading, written and oral communication, and technology. **B. Aligned with curriculum standards and outcomes.** All students know the learning targets and their progress towards meeting them. **C. Integrated across content areas.** All students learn subject matter content that integrates mathematical, scientific, and aesthetic reasoning.	All methodology courses in the American studies/Elementary Education and Human Development/Special Education programs require teacher candidates to align all instruction with content goals consistent with GLEs and to indicate both the student strengths and areas of need along with the school/community setting in which instruction is taking place. I. *Examples of evidence/artifacts:* • Administration and analysis of running record, Informal Reading Inventory, diagnostic surveys, and writing samples, among other measures, to determine a student's reading level and instructional needs • Case study in Reading and Writing for Learners with Special Needs. This requires identification of targeted instruction based on student need • Administration and analysis of spelling inventory to identify student spelling level and targeted instructional needs	I. *Excerpts from rubrics:* • Students demonstrate increased orthographic knowledge. • Students writing shows evidence of writing skill focus of the trade book-based lesson. • Students apply reading comprehension strategies to a content area text. • Students use a teaching tool constructed by the teacher to scaffold their learning of content information. • Report and evidence document how learners engage with subject matter and how they explain choices based on their

- Completed lesson and unit plans across content areas
- Identification of an appropriate writing skill and learning target emanating from the reading of authentic literature
- Use of authentic literature as a source for modeling a writing skill
- Lesson plan teaching strategic reading to access content information required by WA state GLEs
- Review of textbook that includes concepts outlined in the WA State Mathematics GLE's
- Prepared questions that assess how student thinks and understands mathematically relative to grade level expectations.
- Inquiry-based fieldwork based on WA State Science GLEs followed by documentation of the experience; reflection upon the candidate's own role, strengths, and weaknesses in facilitating learning; documentation and assessment of student understanding; and use of assessment to inform teaching.
- Grade appropriate and thematically aligned social studies unit representing themes outlined in the WA State EALRs and GLEs and put forth by the National Council for Social Studies, to include use of primary and secondary sources, student development of an educational product to take the form of dramatic presentation, game, historical biography, table top presentation, or website.

II. Excerpts from rubrics that provide examples of how candidate evidence is being assessed:
- Plan demonstrates an understanding of content areas outlined in the GLEs" (Universal Curriculum Design for Diverse Learners, Reading and Writing for Students with Special Needs, Science Curriculum Field Work, Social Studies Mastery Learning Project, Content Area Reading and Writing,)
- Strategy instruction is in service to content-area meaning-making; the focal point of the lesson is a concept or skill related to the content area not the strategy itself."
- Unit & lesson plans: Utilize a variety of instructional materials & strategies for presenting content & developing skills with students who are struggling with reading & writing
- Review & evaluation: Variety of technology tools that

understandings.
- Plan for targeted instruction is implemented with K-12 student; student response to instruction is documented.

II. Overview of tasks candidates complete with P12 students
- Teacher candidate completes a think aloud with a student and then makes recommendations for the necessary next steps in instruction to improve student reading comprehension and to help the student to be more metacognitive about his/her own thinking while reading.
- Reading interest/self-perception interview is administered to K-12 student(s); students respond referencing their view of their own reading and reading interests.
- Evidence/development of student understanding during the science session. Children's' literature project in Science Methods integrates language arts, technology and science. Candidates present a text/activity to students and use technology to video/photo document and share the experience.
- Informal reading assessment results
- P12 student work and reflections from methods units and lessons.

support science learning, understanding & exploration	

What are the major examples of evidence in your program for Standard 5.2: Knowledge of Teaching? Please be as specific as possible in describing the evidence.

Criteria - *Teacher candidates positively impact student learning that is:*	Teacher-Based Evidence *Teacher demonstrates capacity to provide effective learning experiences.*	Student-Based Evidence *Students demonstrate engagement in effective learning opportunities.*
A. Informed by standards-based assessment. All students benefit from learning that is systematically analyzed using multiple formative, summative, and self-assessment strategies. **B. Intentionally planned.** All students benefit from standards-based planning that is personalized. **C. Influenced by multiple instructional strategies.** All students benefit from personalized instruction that addresses their ability levels and cultural and linguistic backgrounds. **D. Informed by technology.** All students benefit from instruction that utilizes effective technologies and is designed to create technologically proficient learners.	I. *Examples of evidence/ artifacts:* • Designed and implemented behavioral plan • Complete I.E.P. for one student, modify 5 general education lessons for that student, and design 5 additional lesson plans specifically for that student • Adapted lesson plans that meet the needs of all types of learners by using multiple teaching and learning approaches • Lesson plans, unit plans, individualized instruction within case studies, IEP, BIP – all aligned and focused on GLEs as appropriate to plan. • Universally designed and differentiated units of instruction and lesson plans that are differentiated according to student ability/disability, cultural and linguistic background. • Case Study: Assessment & evaluation with determination of eligibility & appropriate placement • Family interviews: Personal experience with identification, placement, working with the educational system • Research: Appropriate assessments for specific disabilities • Case study assessment portfolio: Appropriate assessments for case study student • Paper: Major theories of human development at different points in lifespan • Field-based observations and interviews: Typically and atypically developing children and families at different points in lifespan	I. *Excerpts from rubrics:* • P12 students select mathematics problem solving strategy, use to solve problems, and then explain their selection. • Students apply a specific reading strategy to a content area text. • Students demonstrate increased orthographic knowledge. • Students writing shows evidence of writing skill focus of the trade book-based lesson. • Students use teaching tool to scaffold their learning of content information. *II. Overview of tasks candidates complete with P12 students* • Student generated rubrics • Inquiry-based assessment student responses • Student voice gathered by cooperating teachers and/or supervisors and/or principals via reflections/analysis by candidates • Pre and Post data from IEP lessons in the form of student work, reflections, feedback, videos, behavior assessments, and evidence gathered by parents and general education teachers • Student learning styles inventories and interest surveys • Completed CBAs (those developed by OSPI and/or school/district based assessments) • Candidates address the following questions in math methods: What strategies does the child use to solve the problems? Is it more traditional or inventive? and use student work to support their analysis.

	- and development - Report: Biography of child with disabilities - Report: Autobiography of adolescent with disabilities - Lesson plans: Develop instructional activities that support strengths of a variety of learners - Math Case Study: Use textbook and technology as guide to create 5 student-focused activities leading to student understanding of his/her thinking process. - Assessment and analysis of student orthographic knowledge using a developmental spelling inventory. - Writing skill lesson based on observation of student writing needs. - Development of individualized learning targets based on student performance on a developmental spelling inventory. - Lesson plans depicting varied instruction related to learning targets based on students' performance on a developmental spelling inventory. - Lesson plans on writing skills based on an authentic literature with the needs of a diverse class of students addressed in instructional strategies and assessment. - Technology-based instruction linked to students' learning targets - Use of teaching tool while teaching a strategy-based lesson rooted in standards-based content. - Written rationales for the lessons that include attention to learning outcomes, content and procedural knowledge, multiple intelligence based entry points, integration of other disciplines including art and music, attention to language support for ELL students, and scaffolds that will facilitate participation for all learners. *II. Excerpts from rubrics that provide examples of how candidate evidence is being assessed:*	- Videotapes of students engaged in learning including cooperative groups - Students are given opportunities to determine their own knowledge base in content (e.g. K_W_L) or vocabulary (knowledge-rating charts) - Students use internet technology to conduct age- and content-appropriate research through teacher-designed WebQuests. - Student use of technology in science

• Candidate evaluates student work as a formative assessment for future instruction. • Candidate reflection and analysis demonstrates how learner participation and understandings were used to revise performance and learning targets for subsequent lessons. • Candidate uses a variety of technology tools that support science learning, understanding & exploration. • Lesson plans on writing skills demonstrate use of an authentic literature with the needs of a diverse class of students in mind.	

What are the major examples of evidence in your program for Standard 5.3: Knowledge of Learners and their Development in Social Contexts? Please be as specific as possible in describing the evidence.

What would be the major examples of evidence in your program for

Criteria - *Evidence of teacher candidate practice reflect planning, instruction, and communication that is:*	Teacher-Based Evidence *Teacher demonstrates capacity to provide effective learning experiences.*	Student-Based Evidence *Students demonstrate engagement in effective learning opportunities.*
A. Learner centered. All students engage in a variety of culturally responsive, developmentally, and age appropriate strategies. **B. Classroom/school centered.** Student learning is connected to communities within the classroom and the school, including knowledge and skills for working with others. **C. Family/Neighborhood centered.** Student learning is informed by collaboration with families and neighborhoods. **D. Contextual community centered.**	I. *Examples of evidence/ artifacts:* • Multiple interviews with students and families of students at differing age and ability levels • Design of developmentally appropriate toy for an assigned age and ability group • Written suggestions for classroom and environmental modifications to meet the specific needs and abilities of an observed student • Lesson plans that include cooperative learning activities that support students in working together • Lesson plans that include P-12 student self-assessment and peer assessment • List of organizations that provide knowledge and information on specific disabilities and support families • Informal tests chosen for age- and skill-	I. *Excerpts from rubrics:* • Observe student engagement shows that the instruction is well matched to students' academic needs and social, cultural and linguistic backgrounds. • Student who completes think aloud benefits from teacher candidate-created plan for individual reading comprehension instruction • Summary of session is highly reflective, includes evidence of student understanding and documents the accommodations made throughout the session and the rationale as to why these adaptations were informed by student work (math) • Students self-select readings based on their ability and interest II. *Overview of tasks candidates complete with P12*

All students are prepared to be responsible citizens for an environmentally sustainable, globally interconnected, and diverse society.	appropriateness and for non-discrimination against CLD students • Age- and skill- appropriate reading list built in response to student interests • Completed Functional Behavior Assessment with analysis • Classroom Ecology Analysis • Cooperative Learning Model presentation • Completed and implemented Social Skills plan • Literature lessons for writing skill development based on knowledge of students' academic needs and social, cultural and linguistic backgrounds. • Think aloud assignment with student to establish a developmentally and age-appropriate set of "next steps" for reading comprehension instruction • Analysis and reflection documents on adaptation of initial plan to accommodate information learned during math interview with the child • Candidate analysis of WA state demographic information • Research Project: diverse cultural experiences in US, including African American, Native American, Hispanic and Asian American, with special emphasis on linguistic diversity. • Self-Assessment: Identify one's own cultural filters • Presentation: Cultural or historic experience of one WA cultural group • Written response: History of civil rights movement and how it informed special education practice. • Essay: Historical, political, and social elements and how they have impacted the family and influenced its structure • District reports: Rural, suburban & inner city issues • Reports: Family Interviews • Completed modules from "issues of abuse" course	*students* • Interview responses from with students, parents, and families. • Student reflections and self-assessment from Social Skills plan. • Student-self monitoring strategies from the Functional Behavior Assessment with reflection on progress • Videotapes of P-12 students participating in learning activities that are culturally, developmentally and/or age appropriate and therefore engaging. • Student responses and feedback regarding class meetings from Social Studies Methods. • Projects on democratic citizenship. • Exit slip reflections • Science Children's Literature project has a community service learning component. Candidates present an integrated text to students, video/photo document the experience, and develop a community service-learning project with students. • Student assessment of effectiveness of self and others in group work • Student letters to parents/family about what they are learning; why they are learning it and their own progress • Surveys and student interest inventories • Videos • Photos • Student work

	- Candidate observation and evaluation of several aspects of inclusive classroom. - Parent Interview and with Write-Up and Reflection: Candidates interview a parent of a child with identified special needs regarding the impact of those needs on the child and the family. By means of family interview, students will become aware of the impact of disability on a family. *II. Excerpts from rubrics that provide examples of how candidate evidence is being assessed:* - Successfully collaborates on project development and implementation with partner and school or community. - Questions are carefully thought out to support the understanding of the students' thinking. - Documents learner participation and illustrates connections to school and communities." - Community Profile: Identify support systems and family services. - Candidate individualizes spelling instruction based on their knowledge of students' needs gleaned through a developmental assessment tool and observation of students. Instruction considers students' social, cultural, and linguistic backgrounds.	

What are the major examples of evidence in your program for Standard 5.4: Understanding of Teaching as a Profession? Please be as specific as possible in describing the evidence.

Criteria - *Teacher candidates positively impact student learning that is:*	Teacher-Based Evidence *Teacher demonstrates capacity to provide effective learning experiences.*

A. Informed by professional responsibilities and policies. All students benefit from a collegial and professional school setting. **B. Enhanced by a reflective, collaborative, professional growth-centered practice.** All students benefit from the professional growth of their teachers. **C. Informed by legal and ethical responsibilities.** All students benefit from a safe and respectful learning environment.	*The following bullets outline ongoing opportunities for assessing 5.4* • Candidate participation in collaborative learning communities and develop collegial relationships. • Candidates complete regular needs-based self-reflection resulting in a draft professional growth plan. • Candidate reflection on and use of professional literature as cited in lesson plans, reports, portfolio, and class discussion • Demonstrate dispositions that enhance learning and professional development. • Abide by the Washington State Code of Professional Conduct. • Brief Reflections on evidence from every course • Reflections on group processes *The following bullets provide examples of specific tasks candidates complete through which we assess their reflection, professional growth, collegiality, and dispositions:* • CEC Code of Ethics Development Plan • Written reflection: Collaborating with families. • Written reflection: Working with paraeducators. • Reflections on signature assessments, portfolio reflections, lesson/unit reflections. • Student teaching journal/log. • Emerging Professional Growth Plan. Candidates complete a PGP specifically for student teaching and then complete one at the end of student teaching. • Collaborative work session log and Collaborative Report • Reflections on particular assessments and lessons with P12 students. • Research and article reviews • Professional memberships • completed Issues of Abuse modules • Philosophy of education (comparison of beginning and end of program) • Reflections on practice in student teaching. Three portfolio entries in student teaching (PPA, Build and Maintain a Positive Classroom Environment, Area of Growth during student teaching). • Feedback/evaluations from cooperating teacher and supervisor about classroom environment. • Course journal reflections provide evidence of candidates expanding views and experiences across the program. • Fieldwork assignments document candidates emerging experiences as a professional and the local, national, global factors that influence their work.

1. In a narrative of 7-10 pages, describe how your program has changed to meet the requirements of Standard V in the following areas:
   - Course content
   - Field experiences
   - P-12 district/school partnerships
   - Faculty development

In areas where no changes were necessary, briefly indicate why.

The most significant curricular changes were replacing the course "Schooling in the United States" with "Classroom and Behavior Management" in the Elementary Education program and the addition of a one credit "Issues of Abuse" module for all candidates. To be sure certain aspects of the standard including math/science integration, sustainability, and aesthetic reasoning are adequately *demonstrated* not simply *covered* by all candidates, we have had to redirect or provide more limited parameters for candidate choice in some assignments, particularly in the methods courses. Whereas integration in units developed in science or language arts would have been *encouraged* before, it is required now.

The first course in the program AITND 4002 Research Seminar traditionally has focused primarily on research and writing skills. As part of the major, the class is non-education course. Candidates do conduct research on educational topics. In response to the new Standard V, this course was changed in several ways. Time is now allocated for the candidates to build a social contract to guide the classroom community and their entire cohort experience in the program. After developing and refining their own social contract, candidates then examine Standard 5.3 and discuss additional strategies for addressing those areas. The instructor facilitates candidate development of hypothetical "student" generated rubrics for the oral presentations and research papers. Early in the course, candidates review Standard 5.1: "Students communicate the learning targets and their progress toward them." Then throughout the course, this item is modeled by identifying the session learning target and/or having candidates identify the important learning in an activity, and having candidates complete exit slips at the end of each class.

Our Standard V program revision work has been imbedded in our assessment system development. As we analyzed our Benchmarks to determine what information could be gathered, we determined we needed more detail in knowledge and especially skills. These skills include gathering, analyzing, and using student-based evidence. Thus we undertook a thorough review of the field-based assignments and field-experiences. Based on our findings, we identified a Benchmark assignment for each course and adjusted the Benchmarks to ensure a P12 school-based component is included in each of them. Therefore we can aggregate information about candidates' skills with student evidence. These assignments are generally the culminating or major task from a course and thus encompass many or most of the course outcomes. The signature assessments provide a

window for the program to analyze candidate and cohort growth over time, candidate performance on competencies, and data for program improvement.

At a March 2009 Data retreat, the assessment team also turned their attention to the Phase One Portfolio. Previously, the Phase One Portfolio was primarily a collection portfolio in which candidates selected an item from each course and reflected on how they demonstrated state standards, what they learned, and areas for continued growth. In order to have the Phase One Portfolio be a useful and meaningful Benchmark, candidates are now required to complete the Brief Reflections on the Signature Assessments. Thus the Phase One Portfolio will be a significant vehicle for aggregating and analyzing candidate performance relative to Standard V and the appropriate Endorsement Competencies. The Brief Reflections will now all be assessed by a common rubric rather than by individual instructor expectations. This rubric has been developed and is included on the actual Brief Reflection Form. Thus we are modeling transparency of assessment for candidates. This rubric will further facilitate aggregation and provide a mechanism for tracking mastery of learning. Representatives from arts and sciences responsible for some of the non-education content preparation also attended the data retreat. The agenda included time for discussing strategies for strengthening the linkages between that coursework and education coursework as well as how to include those courses in the overall assessment system. We are currently doing the detail work necessary for the assessment system to function smoothly. This work includes double-checking alignment of the signature assessments to the new Standard V and making necessary changes to the assignments themselves and/or the assessment tool.

As we have dug deeper, we have already further revised several signature assessments and adjusted other assignments within each course. For example, the Content Area Reading, Writing, and Study Skills course uses the book *Strategies that Work* (2007) to help our candidates learn various ways to help struggling readers with content area reading. The new emphasis on student voice and student metacognition, with particular focus on the statements "Use a variety of learning strategies and can explain the effectiveness of their choice" and "Articulate the thinking strategies used to achieve the learning targets" led to a new assignment for candidates. Candidates now complete a think aloud as they read two passages, one easy and one more challenging. They then answer several reflective questions and compare their strategies with those in text. Thus they experience these two Standard V items from the perspective of a student, next they plan a strategy lesson that incorporates similar opportunities for reflection on the part of P12 students, and finally they teach it in their practicum. In the Math Assessment Case Study, candidates have traditionally conducted several math assessments with an elementary student, analyzed the results and reflected on their mid-course adjustments based on the results, and designed a series of next step lesson plans to meet the individual student needs. This assignment now requires an interview component as one of the assessments. This interview helps candidates gather and analyze student voice evidence and practice engaging students in their own learning. The rubric for the Behavior Intervention Plan was also completely re-written to better align with the new standard and to involve students more fully.

The specific Signature Assessments that comprise the Phase One Portfolio with a brief description of each are listed below:

Special Education
- Assistive/Adaptive Technology Review
- Case Study of P-12 student in Math
- Universally designed unit and lesson plans
- Functional Behavioral Analysis and Behavior Intervention Plan
- Collaboration Report and Evaluation
- Individualized Growth Plan (for P12 student) in Reading and Writing for Learners with Special Needs

Elementary Education:
- Mastery Learning Project in Social Studies
- Think Aloud Teacher and Student as Reader in Content Area Reading and Writing
- Behavior Intervention Plan in Classroom Management
- Science Curriculum Field-Work
- Math Assessment Case Study
- Integrating Literacy Unit

We are currently working with faculty from the major courses across the university to identify signature assessments for the non-education majors. Though these are not education courses, we believe it is important to include assessment data from the majors in our overall assessment system. In addition, we must introduce more aspects of the revised Standard V in the majors in order to adequately prepare candidates for field-experiences and student teaching. Work to integrate Standard V (education objectives) in non-education courses is, understandably, more complicated than revisions to the education minors. We have made progress nonetheless. The Applied Ecology and the Fine Arts in Washington courses already have a signature assessment identified and revised to align with Standard V. Additional work will be completed during a retreat of the faculty in June.

The program includes repeated opportunities for candidates to assess and plan for instruction. Planning requirements range from conducting a case study and planning an intervention for an individual student to preparing lesson plans for a single lesson to developing an entire unit using universal design for learning. Components 5.1A, 5.1B, 5.2A, and 5.2B are well addressed for our candidates. However, we have revised several of the assignments to both better prepare candidates for using student based evidence, especially student voice. The revisions will also solicit better evidence for program review and improvement. For example, the lesson plan template given to candidates was revised to better align to Standard V. This template is used in all courses. Thus candidates will have repeated exposure and practice intentionally for student voice prior to student teaching. All lesson or unit plans now require candidates to answer the questions:
- What strategies will you use to help students understand the learning target(s)?

- What evidence will you gather to assess their understanding of the target?
- How will you use that evidence to inform and revise your teaching?

Additionally, all courses and assignments will now refer to lesson objectives or learning outcomes as learning targets. To close the assessment circle, candidates have always responded to the question: "How will you know if the students achieved the intended outcomes?" The lesson plan now also includes a follow-up question: "How will you know that your students understand the learning target?" Previously, one or two methods courses focused on integration of subject matter and candidates typically designed integrated lessons for math and science. Now, all lesson plans must indicate the primary subject area and then outline strategies for integration (5.1C).

Student Teaching Semester
Several revisions were implemented in student teaching for Spring 2009.
1. Added a behavior plan that focused on student voice. This behavior plan *starts* with interviewing the student. In the interview, teacher candidates were asked to get to know the students, their interests, motives, and ensure that the student understood the problem that needed to be addressed. In addition, the teacher candidates needed to ensure that the student was involved and had a say in shaping their behavior.

2. Added emphasis and time spent on P12 student self-assessments. Teacher candidates looked at examples, read articles about why student voice/ involvement is necessary and then implemented strategies with their students. Articles included *Assessment Through Student Eyes* by Rick Stiggins and *The Wounded Student* by Kirsten Olson.

3. Journal/ reflections focused on understanding the student and who they are as individuals.

4. Class discussions about promoting active involvement of the P12 students and families by talking with the P12 students, student motivation, and strategies for family feedback.

5. Revision of Phase 2 Portfolio (P2P) completed during student teaching.
   a. In the P2P, teacher candidates complete three Entries called Areas of Achievement. Area of Achievement One is titled "Curriculum and Pedagogy." This Area of Achievement was revised to require artifacts of student learning over time and candidates are assessed on their analysis of student learning using the student evidence artifacts. Previously, candidates were able to select a focus for Areas of Achievement Two and Three.
   b. Since classroom environment and citizenship as influenced by contextual information is now a full fourth of the standard, we aligned Area of Achievement Two to 5.3. Candidates must now show how their strategies specific to classroom environment are research-based, appropriate to the context of the learners, and then provide

            student-based evidence that demonstrates a positive impact specific to 5.3. This area of achievement is also assessed for democratic principles and collaboration with families.

      c.   We reorganized the questions for both the P1P and the P2P so they are categorized as description, analysis, and reflection.   This emphasis on the three types of writing aligns with the continuum of educator development and the types of writing that will be expected in Professional Certification and National Board Certification.

Additional revisions will be implemented with the next cohort of student teachers in Spring 2010. These revisions include re-ordering certain topics and weaving others throughout the course for stronger emphasis. For example, assessment will now be part of every single seminar session so there can be more support and time for candidates to plan for, gather, and analyze a wider variety of formative and summative assessments particularly student voice feedback. We will also revise our observation protocol used by University Supervisors. During most observations, they will now ask the P12 students questions such as "what are you learning today," and other questions about the learning environment, lessons, and activities.

The revisions to standard V have caused us to seek specific revisions to our "memorandum of agreements" with our district partners. Specifically, we are developing more opportunities for our candidates who are paraeducators to conduct observations and complete field-experiences in a wider variety of settings. We have also presented the co-teaching model for student teaching to several of our district partners. Enthusiasm is building and we plan to send our supervisors to the fall co-teaching workshop with an open invitation to our district partners and cooperating teachers. We plan to implement co-teaching for our student teachers in spring 2010. The co-teaching model will provide candidates significantly more opportunities for gathering, analyzing, and using student evidence since they will be directly involved in instruction for the entire fourteen weeks of student teaching. We have discussed the increased requirements for P12 student evidence with our PEAB at length. The PEAB recommended placing each student teacher with a "team" of P12 teachers by grade level or role. Candidates could potentially receive mentoring from teachers skilled in different content or pedagogy areas and spend more time teaching without "taking over" an entire class for several weeks. In addition we have met with the principal of Henderson Bay High School in Peninsula as a possible practicum/partnership school. Candidates will potentially work with specific students or groups of students over several semesters. This consistency over time will provide candidates more opportunity for gathering and analyzing their own impact on P12 students. More than 80% of our candidates are currently working as paraeducators. We are considering activities within the program when these paraeducators could bring in student evidence and student work from the classrooms in which they work. This strategy will provide more real-life real-time examples instructors can use when introducing concepts or modeling student work analysis. Then candidates will use protocols for student work review to share and analyze the evidence.

Standard V has also influenced our adjunct faculty recruitment and hiring procedures. We have intentionally sought local adjuncts with experience in seeking and using student voice. Our introductory materials and support structures for adjuncts have been expanded to include a fuller description of how their course fits into the overall program and their role in the

assessment system. Included in this description is more detail outlining which components in the course are flexible and which (like the previously described questions on the lesson plan template) must be included. Our student teaching supervisor training will also be expanded to include student-voice. Our next student teaching cohort is not until Spring 2010 and we hoped to have the new Evidence-based Pedagogy Assessment for use in the supervisor training and for field testing. We have reviewed the conceptual model from the committee shared at the April WACTE meeting. Even without the actual assessment, this conceptual model has already raised questions about our current student teaching portfolio and the specific items we require candidates to complete during student teaching.

The new standard has proven very helpful in our ongoing efforts to assess candidate dispositions. The Description of Practice for 5.4 is now included in the Community Standards of Conduct policy in their program handbook. We have discussed dispositions at every PEAB meeting in 2008-2009.

As discussed throughout this document, we have updated candidate handbooks, syllabi, and assignments. We are developing a glossary for candidates and developing other resources. Some of these resources will likely be exemplars adapted from the CD resources provided by OSPI.

Areas Not Changed
The "Lesley Way" already recognizes the importance of building on the candidates' own experience, guiding them to own their learning, and helping them grow from "received knowers" to integrated and self-directed learners. We begin drawing on candidate experience and voice in the prerequisite course titled "Writing the Autobiography" and this theme carries through the program. This emphasis is a good match with the focus in Standard V on student-centered learning.

The program already provides strong preparation in lesson planning that is deeply embedded in content and aligned to state standards and learning goals. Candidate learning of lesson design and implementation is well scaffolded with multiple opportunities for collaboration, guided practice, feedback, and implementation with P12 students. All candidates are taught universal design for learning and must demonstrate application in their lessons and units.

In addition, the Elementary Education program already thoroughly addresses environmental sustainability through a course titled "Applied Ecology from Perspectives of Science and Public Policy in America." Course outcomes include:
- Acquire the knowledge, skills and methodology needed to look at significant ecological issues from scientific and public policy points of view
- Know and apply science concepts and skills to develop solutions to human problems in societal contexts
- Work within the political, social, and educational systems toward affirmative, progressive change.

- Know and apply scientific concepts and principles to understand the properties, structures, and changes in physical, earth/space, and living systems.
- Investigate issues that have personal meaning, as well as larger societal and global implications.
- Know and apply the skills, processes, and nature of scientific inquiry to explore the scientific, ethical, emotional, and cultural parameters that are involved in the complex web of decision-making and judgment necessary to weigh and balance the interests of individual needs, local communities, wild ecosystems, resources, and the economy.
- Learn geography and science skills, including map reading, weather concepts and patterns, geological constructs, and the relationship of geography to science, policy, and political development in civilizations.

2. **In no more than three pages, describe the *process* used to engage program personnel in reviewing, rethinking, and revising the program**.

The new Standard V document was first introduced to the PEAB in November 2007. Some aspect of the revised Standard V and necessary program adjustments have been discussed at every PEAB meeting since. Throughout the process, the PEAB has reviewed all proposed curricular revisions, draft reports, and templates. Due to various personal circumstances and job changes, we had several new members join the PEAB at the October 2008 and February and May 2009 meetings. Therefore, most meetings have begun with an overview of the new Standard V and evidence-based systems of educator preparation. These repeated overviews have also been very helpful for faculty and other program personnel. Despite an almost entirely new PEAB, their feedback has been invaluable to the program. In particular the PEAB has given useful feedback regarding field experiences, candidate dispositions, and specific strategies for gathering student evidence that align with P12 practices such as the Classroom Based Assessments (CBAs) for social studies. Dispositions and field experiences were discussed at every PEAB meeting in 2008-2009 academic year.

An ongoing part of the process is building shared understanding of program personnel. As further explained in the next question, the emphasis on student-based evidence and student voice meshes well with the Lesley University approach to learning and teaching. That said, we have encountered the challenge of reconciling the language used in Standard V with language used in the program. We have worked together to build a shared understanding of what specific student and candidate evidence could be expected. Nearly every discussion and work session on Standard V has included time for clarification of language, restating expectations and surfacing assumptions. For example at one meeting, a program director stated "show me in the standard where it says student voice." This statement led to a valuable discussion of the standard itself, what will constitute quality evidence, and some postulating about the nature of the site visit protocol. We, like others, have had to intentionally and continually shake loose from the connotations immediately associated with the term "student voice" to focus instead on the intent. To build this shared understanding, program representatives have attended Standard V implementation workshops conducted by OSPI and the Higher Education/OSPI Assessment Conference. All resources including the draft glossary, evidence CDs, standards documents, and so forth have been distributed.

16

While developing understanding is an ongoing, recursive process, our assessment team took responsibility for adjusting the Tacoma program to address the new Standard V. This core working group included the Elementary and Special Education program directors, the unit head, program coordinator, and core faculty representatives from each program. In addition, the director of field placement, the portfolio coordinator, certification officer and additional faculty have contributed at key points in the process. The assessment team took the charge because Standard V must be reflected in the assessment system, especially as an evidence-based standard. We have met together approximately twice/month to work specifically on Standard V and our assessment system. We held two day long retreats, one in October and one in March. Another retreat is planned for June 10. At the June retreat, we will analyze the most recent student teaching portfolios and signature assessments already completed by candidates to analyze the quantity and quality of student-based evidence being generated.

The assessment team analyzed all components of the programs from in-class discussions and activities to formal tasks completed in the field with P12 students. In particular, we looked for alignment and match to Standard V. This check included frequency and depth of coverage to determine which standard V components were well represented, which were minimally assessed, and which were not represented at all. This analysis informed our decisions about program changes. In many instances, we needed only to adjust certain assignments/tasks candidates complete in order to solicit the desired evidence. Our analysis of Standard V has led to lengthy and meaningful discussions about the length, timing, and requirements for pre-student teaching field experiences. A sub-committee was then formed to redesign the early field experiences to complement and integrate field-based assignments within courses. Our intent is to provide students with rich observations and repeated opportunities to practice teaching and targeted skills building needed for student teaching. The sub-committee met three times in the spring of 2009.

These curricular adjustments to assignments, assessments, and candidate materials are relatively straightforward. As the core working group made recommendations for these adjustments, it became clear the larger task would be the development of a clear and coherent scaffolding of instruction to prepare candidates for shift in the assignments. While the wording is relatively minor, the actual shift in emphasis is no small thing. Therefore, representatives from the across the university responsible for the major coursework, are included in every meeting.

As actual implementation of revisions neared, we realized that a wider group needed to be involved and understand the nature of the revisions. Thus the adjunct faculty packet is being significantly revised and we are holding several course mentor meetings to further develop our shared understanding. During one course mentor meeting, there was lengthy discussion about modeling the expectations in Standard V and strategies for making explicit connections in the major coursework even though those are not education courses. This meeting was extremely well received. The course mentors expressed an eagerness to collaborate on the efforts and several expressed how helpful it was to talk in a group about specific assessment expectations and procedures and their roles/responsibilities. All faculty including course mentors and adjuncts were given Standard V and asked to further analyze their particular courses and make any additional necessary adjustments. These adjustments were then shared out and reviewed by the group at large as well as the PEAB.

Other individuals with more peripheral roles participated in various Standard V discussions. These individuals include the Director of Institutional Research, Associate Provost, Director of State Relations, and representatives from the undergraduate programs in Lesley College. All key players in the program provided input and feedback on the actual approval templates and interim reports to the PESB.

3. **In no more than two pages, describe the key strategies by which candidates will develop capacity to analyze and respond to student-based evidence. Please attach three samples of assignments or assessments that represent those strategies**.
Lesley University uses a mastery of learning model. The strategies by which candidates will develop capacity to analyze and respond to student-based evidence rises out of our understanding of the adult learner.

Adult Pedagogy: Generally speaking, we believe that students come to us with rich experiences, which can inform and enhance their learning and "theory poor". Further, we believe in Kolb's experiential model that people learn through a process which includes some experiential learning as well as theoretical knowledge. Thus we encourage faculty to begin with candidates' experience and to provide a variety experiences and opportunities for candidates to demonstrate their learning including field trips, simulations, role playing, group work, learning with and through the arts, classroom and school interviews and observations, all of which involve candidates experientially. Mary Belenky's *Women's Ways of Knowing* is key to understanding our pedagogy. She and her colleagues describe stages of the learner which run from "received knower" (someone looking for the teacher or outside expert to tell her what is worth knowing and thinking) through subjective learner (who believes her own experience to be the only important knowledge) to integrated and self directed learner (who is able to integrate several perspectives with her own and crate new knowledge and theory). We see these stages as developmental. The instructor's responsibility is to move students towards the next stage from where they are. Thus we encourage faculty to question students who ask "what do you want", to push students to jointly develop standards for work, and to foster a risk taking and supportive learning environment.

Cognitive Development: We think faculty should be acquainted with research on multiple paths to learning, differences in the way people learn, and some of the recent research on biology and chemistry of the brain. We encourage faculty to develop many ways for candidates to show what they know, to learn new things, and to develop all their modes of learning. We also believe that candidates should be continually engaged in reflection on how they and others learn. In short we value attention to metacognition. We believe candidates should be encouraged to critique material and delivery models in reference to their knowledge of learning style and cognitive development. The cycle of learning, we believe, involves students moving between theory and practice with frequent reflection along that spectrum.

18

We also expect students to investigate bias in their own thinking and in the materials they read. We expect students to grow in their ability to advocate for justice in the world, to be involved as change agents, and to see themselves as teacher-leaders in their field.

Constructivist Pedagogy; we believe knowledge is socially and culturally constructed in group. We strive for transformative education. We believe that constructivist education which begins with what the students bring and is informed by the group process as well as new knowledge and meaningful action leads to transformative and emancipatory education. Our work is influenced by Delpit, Nieto, hooks, Freire and other writers of critical pedagogy. We believe the classroom environment should be interdisciplinary, foster multicultural understanding, and promote inclusive thinking. .

This framework, which has guided the Lesley University adult baccalaureate programs for over twenty years is well suited to prepare candidates to focus on student-based evidence and facilitate classrooms in which students are active participants a democratic learning process. While our overall model is constructivist in nature, we are very intentional in scaffolding candidate learning experiences and providing direct instruction when necessary and appropriate   Thus mastery of learning relative to the new components of standard five will be developed in a basic three-step recursive process: faculty modeling, candidate planning, and candidate implementation of instruction with an emphasis actual analysis of student-evidence.

Modeling
Candidates will first be introduced to student-based evidence including student voice from the perspective of a student. As previously mentioned, we are working to explicitly model strategies beginning in their very first courses. Candidates will consider how their own learning experience in this environment is similar to and different from their past educational experiences. Our candidates complete an associate's degree prior to entering our program and typically have thus been conditioned that there is a right and wrong way to complete assignments. In addition, since the majority are non-traditional aged career changers, most of them completed their own P12 journey long before Education Reform began. They fit the classic definition of "received knowers." Thus our first task is to guide them in such a way that they will own their own learning and begin to experience the power in a student-centered learning and teaching environment. Early Field experiences and field-based assignments within both the major and the minor are designed to help candidates recognize student ways of knowing, and how teachers modify instruction based on student evidence. Specific examples include metacogntitive reflection activities, self-assessments, and exit slips.

Candidate Planning
Once candidates have experienced a learner centered environment, they will begin to integrate strategies for gathering and using student-based evidence and student voice in their own lesson and unit plans. At this point in their development, they will be practicing specific components of the overall teaching cycle such as selecting appropriate learning targets, planning instruction using universal design, and gathering assessment data. They must learn how to intentionally plan for meaningful student evidence before they ever actually use it. During this phase, candidates will analyze and reflect on student evidence

from P12 classrooms gathered by their paraeducator colleagues or during their early field-experiences. While they may not have generated the evidence themselves, candidates will begin to understand the necessity of planning for evidence.

Implementation
As candidates progress through the program, they will be required to increasingly integrate their planning skills. They will begin to work directly with P12 students in a variety of settings and within all content areas. They will conduct case studies, develop behavior plans, teach lessons and/or short units. Finally, upon entering student teaching, candidates will put it all together: assessing, planning, instructing, assessing, and analyzing evidence.

4. **In no more than two pages, describe areas of your revised program that will be a focus of continuing attention and development as you proceed with implementation**.

An area of continued attention is field experiences. Our program is designed for working adults who would not otherwise be able to access teacher preparation. The significant majority of our candidates are currently paraeducators and thus already spend a lot of time in schools. We are working to integrate more field-based assignments that these candidates can complete in their own settings. Our challenge is to balance an accessible program with the necessity of ensuring candidates have a variety of field experiences. Component 5.3 is also more of a challenge for candidates to gather student-based evidence since teacher candidates are guests in someone's classroom. We are exploring a weeklong "August Experience" in which candidates will do a mini practicum with a teacher as s/he sets up the classroom and prepares for the year. This experience will include the first few days of school so the candidates can observe and participate in building a classroom community.

While we have made progress toward more adequately assessing dispositions, we still are not where we want to be. We have the outline of when candidate dispositions should be assessed and who should be involved in that assessment. However, we are still working on what specific dispositions to assess and how to gather this information.

Like many programs we are still wrestling with the term "student voice" as a particular type of student based evidence. This is especially true for our special education program. In keeping with good practice, we want to be able to provide candidates specific examples of student voice evidence from the wide range of special education populations.

Sustainability education is well addressed in the Elementary Program. We are still not completely sure how to weave this topic into Special Education. We know we will not add an extra course and our intent is to integrate it into an existing course or courses. Integrating this topic in an authentic way is proving challenging, however, without making it an artificial add-on

5. **Please attach a letter from the PEAB chair that describes the PEAB's involvement in reviewing and revising the program.**